UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,401	09/23/2003	Gerald Altman	5957-72402	9364

35690 7590 12/30/2009

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER	
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/30/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent_docketing@intprop.com
ptomhkkg@gmail.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,401	ALTMAN, GERALD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KIMBERLY LOVEL	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 August 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *24-30,33,35-37,41-45,48-54,56-63,65-72 and 75* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *24-30, 33, 35-37, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72 and 75* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed 31 August 2009.

2. Claims 24-30, 33, 35-37, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63 and 65-74 are currently pending and claims 1-23, 31, 32, 34, 38-40, 46, 47, 55, 64, 73 and 74 have been canceled. In the Amendment filed 31 August 2009, claims 24-27, 33, 35-37, 41, 43, 44, 48, 52-54, 56, 61-63, 65, 66 and 68-72 have been amended and claim 75 is new. This action is made Final.

3. The previous prior art rejections have been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Objections

4. The objections to Claims 24, 41, 48 and 56 have been withdrawn.

35 USC § 101 - Clarifications

5. It is noted that the claimed computer readable memory medium is considered to be represented by the disclosed computer (see Remarks, page 9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 24-30, 33, 35-37, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2002/0111960 to Irons et al (hereafter Irons) in view of US Patent 6,236,767 to Altman (hereafter Altman) in view of US Patent No 6,092,090 to Payne et al (hereafter Payne).

Referring to claim 24, Irons discloses a method, comprising:

receiving a succession of electronic documents into a computer document management system, wherein each of the succession of electronic documents is received at a corresponding point in time [scanning the documents] (see [0044]); and

for each of at least a subset of the received electronic documents:

the computer system generating a corresponding unique identifier [globally unique identifier] identifying a date [date] that corresponding to the point in time at which the electronic document was received by the computer system (see [0047] and [0048]); and

the computer system storing, a respective plurality of attributes relating to the electronic document in each of a plurality of tables, wherein each of the plurality of tables includes the generated unique time-based identifier as one of

its respective plurality of attributes, and wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes a first attribute containing information indicating a location of a physical document corresponding to the electronic document (see [0047] and [0078]); and

the computer system accessing the plurality of attributes [meta-data] for the electronic document in at least one of the plurality of tables using the corresponding unique identifier [globally unique identifier] for the electronic document (see [0041] and [0047]).

Irons fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the computer system generating a corresponding unique time-based identifier identifying a date and time of day that corresponding to the point in time at which the electronic document was received by the computer system. Altman discloses document management of physical documents and paper documents (see abstract), including the further limitation of the computer system generating a corresponding unique time-based identifier identifying a date and time of day that corresponding to the point in time at which the electronic document was received by the computer system [a value in the date/time field of the first table is automatically generated by the system during scanning] (see column 4, lines 43-47) and the computer system storing, in a storage array, a respective plurality of attributes relating to the electronic document in each of a plurality of tables of a relational database accessible to the computer system, wherein each of the plurality of tables includes the generated unique time-based identifier as one of its respective plurality of attributes, and wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes a first

attribute containing information indicating a location of a physical document corresponding to the electronic document (see Fig 4 and column 3, lines 10-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the concept of a time-based identifier representing the time a document is scanned into the system and a relational database as disclosed by Altman as the global identifier and database of Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the identifier of Irons can be anything that identifies the document and a relational database is a standard storage system well-known in the art.

The combination of Irons/Altman fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of a storage array. Payne discloses a document management system, including the further limitation of a storage array storing the attributes (see column 4, lines 22-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the array of Payne to store the tables of Irons/Altman. One would have been motivated to do so since arrays allow for a Raid and a Raid provides for redundant storage and fault tolerance.

Referring to claims 41, 48 and 56 and 75, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 24.

Referring to claim 25, the combination of Irons/Altman and Payne (hereafter Irons/Altman/Payne) discloses the method of claim 24, wherein, for a given electronic document received by the computer system: a first of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to an entity originating the given electronic document (see [0048]; Altman: see column 4, lines 29-52)); and a second of the

plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to the location of a physical document corresponding to the given electronic document (Irons: see [0041]; Altman: see column 4, lines 29-52).

Referring to claims 43, 52 and 61, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 25.

Referring to claim 26, Irons/Altman/Payne discloses the method of claim 25, wherein a date and time of day at which a given electronic documents is received by the computer system corresponds to a date and time of day at which the first electronic document was created by imaging a physical document (Altman: see column 4, lines 43-47).

Referring to claims 49, 50, 51, 58 and 59, the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 26.

Referring to claim 27, Irons/Altman/Payne discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising the computer system retrieving a given electronic document in the succession of electronic documents from the storage array using the corresponding unique time-based identifier for the given electronic document; and wherein the time of day is specified by at least an hour value, a minutes value, and a seconds value [processing unit computes requested subsets of electronic images] (Altman: see column 5, lines 8-28 and Fig 4).

Referring to claims 60 and 66-68, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 27.

Referring to claim 28, Irons/Altman/Payne discloses the method of claim 24, wherein said receiving includes: receiving imaged electronic documents (Irons: see [0044], lines 7-10); and/or receiving computer generated electronic documents (Irons: see [0044], lines 11-13).

Referring to claims 45 and 65, the claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 28.

Referring to claim 29, Irons/Altman/Payne discloses the method of claim 28, wherein the imaged electronic documents include electronic documents that were created by imaging corresponding physical documents, wherein each corresponding physical document is marked with the corresponding unique time-based identifier after said imaging (Altman: see column 4, lines 54-65).

Referring to claim 30, Irons/Altman/Payne discloses the method of claim 28, wherein the computer generated electronic documents include electronic documents received from one or more of the following sources: word processing programs, graphics programs, e-mail, facsimile transmissions [e-mail] (Irons: see [0044]).

Referring to claim 33, Irons/Altman/Payne discloses the method of claim 24, further comprising: accessing a first electronic document stored in the storage system using a first unique time-based identifier, wherein the first unique time-based identifier corresponds to a first date and point in time of day when the first electronic document was received into the document management system (Irons: see [0041]; Altman: see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 9).

Referring to claims 42 and 57, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 33.

Referring to claim 35, Irons/Altman/Payne discloses the method of claim 25, wherein: a third of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to a task associated with the given electronic document; and a fourth of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to the physical document that corresponds to the given electronic document, wherein an attribute in the fourth table includes a type of physical document (Irons: see [0047]-[0048]).

Referring to claims 43, 53 and 62, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 35.

Referring to claim 36, Irons/Altman/Payne discloses the method of claim 35, wherein a fifth of the plurality of tables is configured to store a unique value for the given document, wherein the unique value is formed by a combination of a value of a first key of the first table and a value of a second key of the second table (Irons: see [0048]).

Referring to claims 44, 54, 63 and 69-72, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 36.

Referring to claim 37, Irons/Altman/Payne discloses the method of claim 36, wherein each of the tables is searchable using one or more attributes in addition to the unique time-based identifier (Irons: see [0048]).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/Kimberly Lovel/
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

20 December 2009
/KL/